

1 L. LIN WOOD, P.C.  
2 L. Lin Wood (*pro hac vice*)  
lwood@linwoodlaw.com  
3 Nicole J. Wade (*pro hac vice*)  
nwade@linwoodlaw.com  
4 Jonathan D. Grunberg (*pro hac vice*)  
jgrunberg@linwoodlaw.com  
5 G. Taylor Wilson (*pro hac vice*)  
twilson@linwoodlaw.com  
6  
7 1180 West Peachtree Street, Ste. 2040  
8 Atlanta, Georgia 30309  
9 404-891-1402  
404-506-9111 (fax)

10 WEISBART SPRINGER HAYES, LLP  
11 Matt C. Wood (*pro hac vice*)  
mwood@wshllp.com  
12 212 Lavaca Street, Ste. 200  
13 Austin, TX 78701  
14 512-652-5780  
512-682-2074 (fax)

CHATHAM LAW GROUP  
Robert Christopher Chatham  
chris@chathamfirm.com  
CA State Bar No. 240972  
3109 W. Temple St.  
Los Angeles, CA 90026  
213-277-1800

16 Attorneys for Plaintiff VERNON UNSWORTH

17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
18 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

19 VERNON UNSWORTH,

Case No. 2:18-cv-08048-SVW (JCx)  
Judge: Hon. Stephen V. Wilson

20 Plaintiff,

21 v.  
22  
23 ELON MUSK,  
24 Defendant.

**PLAINTIFF VERNON UNSWORTH'S  
NOTICE OF WITHDRAWAL OF ERIC  
ROSE AS AN EXPERT WITNESS**

25 Pretrial Conference: Nov. 25, 2019  
Hearing Date: n/a  
Time: n/a  
Courtroom: n/a

1       In his Rule 26(a)(2)(B) Expert Disclosures, Plaintiff identified Eric W. Rose  
2 as one of his expert witnesses. Plaintiff has now determined that it is not necessary  
3 to introduce Mr. Rose's expert testimony at trial to establish actual and/or presumed  
4 damages in this case and therefore withdraws his identification of Mr. Rose as an  
5 expert witness who will testify at trial.

6       Defendant's Motion in Limine No. 4 to exclude the expert opinion of Mr.  
7 Rose (Doc. 100) is therefore moot.<sup>1</sup>

8                      Dated: November 13, 2019      L. LIN WOOD, P.C.  
9

10                     By: /s/L. Lin Wood  
11                     L. Lin Wood  
12                     *Attorneys for Plaintiff Vernon Unsworth*  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

---

27       <sup>1</sup> Although Plaintiff does not concede the points raised in Defendant's motion, the  
28 withdrawal of Mr. Rose as a testifying expert negates the need for any opposition  
to that motion as it has now been rendered moot.